



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/744,612	03/09/2001	Sami Uskela	617-010120-US	1625
2512	7590	08/25/2006		EXAMINER
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			ZEWDU, MELESS NMN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SF

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/744,612	USKELA, SAMI	
	Examiner Meless N. Zewdu	Art Unit 2617	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 16 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 15.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 6-13, 22, 23, 44 and 46-55.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The feature that calls for information "that defines handover number", recited in new claims 56-58 requires further consideration and/or search..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The combined prior art , taken as a whole, reads on the claims as shown/discussed in the body of the rejection of the claims (see attached detailed action for further explanation)..

Zwick, Reber, 8-21-06

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Examiner finds it necessary to respond to applicant's argument regarding Acharya et al.'s reference (US 5,974,036). While admitting the cited prior art teaches about a mobile handover operation from a first base station to a second base station, the following issues were raised in applicant's argument regarding the cited prior art.

Initial remark: applicant has included claims 56-58 reciting a feature "that defines a handover number" which raises a new issue (new issues) that requires further consideration and/or search.

Argument I: with regard to the original claims, applicant argues by saying "there is nothing in Acharya that discloses that the mobile originates the second call as claimed by applicant."

Response I: examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument. First, examiner interprets the first and second calls as a first and second connection between a mobile terminal and a first and a second base stations, since the calls begin and end between these devices, i. e., with out external calling party and since there is not feature in the claims that distinguishes the call from a connection/link. Second, the mobile station/terminal in Acharya's reference makes connections with both a first and second base stations, wherein the connection with the second base station could be interpreted as a second call by the mobile terminal to the second base station. Third, there is also connection/communication between the first and second base stations and the first and

second switches (see fig. 4) in the operation of the prior art handover to transfer the mobile terminal from a first base station to the second (see also claims 1-4). Hence, the argument is not persuasive.

Argument II: Applicant further argues by saying “there is no suggestion or motivation in Acharya related to a first network transmitting data indicating an identification for the handover to the mobile station.”

Response II: In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, one of ordinary skill in the art would find Acharya's reference compelling to further modify the references applied the claims being argued for the advantage minimizing latency, cell loss and maintain efficient use of network resources and QoS for dynamically rerouted cells (see col. 2, lines 46-59, particularly lines 46-51).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meless N. Zewdu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7873. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm..

Art Unit: 2617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corsaro Nick can be reached on (571) 272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600

Meless Zewdu



Examiner

21 August 2006.